

about how we should take this "surplus" and how we should spend it. And as my colleague from South Carolina has said, what that means is, if we got a surplus, there are all kinds of ideas how people are now suggesting that this surplus stays here in Washington and we spend it rather than securing our future for the next generation or paying down the debt or reducing the taxes. It seems like there are a lot of people who believe Washington should be first in line and we ought to accelerate now that growth in spending, and that is the wrong thing to do.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me go into one area so that we are completely honest with the American public.

The President has sent the House and the Senate a supplemental bill. There is great debate on what the deficit is in terms of the need of our military, especially now when we are now exposed on one front and potentially exposed on another front. There is no question that we have underfunded the requirements to have a readiness capable military. There is some debate about the money.

But the American public needs to make known to this body and to the Senate that if in fact they do not want Social Security money used to pay for that, they better let their representatives know it, because that is exactly what is going to happen.

The group of gentlemen that are with me have routinely fought to pay for everything that we do up here by cutting some program somewhere else. I do not believe that is going to happen this time, and it is not ever going to happen until we continue to contrast that when we spend money, that we are not willing to have the courage to cut spending somewhere else.

Where are we getting the money? We are stealing it from Social Security. We should not run from that issue. We should talk about that issue. And as we talk about it, I believe the public will demand on the body politic in this country to do the sharpening and cut the fat and promote the efficiency that we need.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, Madeleine Albright came and testified before one of the committees that I am on, the Committee on International Relations, today, and she testified before the Senate yesterday. And on this very point, I think her reply was interesting, because when asked, should we offset the proposed supplemental for Kosovo, the answer was no, because if we did that it would mean money could come out of USAID, the State Department and a host of other priorities, as she put it, here in Washington.

The simple question the people need to ask back home is, is USAID and State Department spending a higher priority for them or is the money going to their Social Security a higher priority, is a question that needs to be asked.

Mr. COBURN. Absolutely. And it needs to be raised and continue to be

talked about so that Washington hears. I know what that answer is in the American public. It is the same everywhere. "Get your hands off my Social Security money. Make the hard choices somewhere else."

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I think the other interesting question is not only to ask is this more important than Social Security, it is if we are risking young men and young women's lives in Kosovo, is there no place else in the budget that we could find \$6 billion? Is the only thing to say it is an emergency, not say everything else is as equal of a priority?

I think as we have taken a look at all of this, we spend \$1.7 trillion per year. We all know that there is lots of bureaucracy, there is lots of red tape. There are other places where, if we really went after it, we could find the dollars to fund this without raiding Social Security and be able to do Kosovo and just say for those Members that believe it, this mission in Kosovo is so important we are willing to reduce spending in some other areas because this is a new priority.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on that because I think sometimes that does get lost in this whole debate.

This budget we are talking about this year is \$1,700 billion. Even \$6 billion, which I think is a little bit pricey for what we hope to achieve in Kosovo, but that is a separate debate, even that, though, represents a relatively small percent and about one-half of 1 percent of the total Federal budget. So the idea that we cannot find the money with offsets somewhere else in the budget, I think outside of this Capitol and outside of the circle here in Washington, I think most people do not believe that.

But I want to come back to another point, and really it does come back to in terms of our cost for defense in these special supplemental appropriations and I think it is an important one. I think the American people need to know that over the last 40 years, up until the last 8 years, the United States had deployed troops around the world 8 times, but in the last 8 years, we have deployed troops 33 times. And I think sometimes we have to ask, is all of this really that necessary? Is it worthwhile? I mean, this is an enormous expense to the taxpayers.

I think there is another question that needs to be asked before we vote on the supplemental, and that is about burden sharing. When President Bush decided that we had to stand up to Saddam Hussein, he went to our allies and he got them to pony up. And the net was the war in the desert actually made money for us. We actually came out ahead on the Desert Storm operation.

I think it is time for us to be brutally honest with our allies in Europe, that if they want us to help participate in a war that is really much more important to Europe than it is to people of the United States, then there ought to be a better cost sharing, a burden sharing.

Because right now, basically, our obligation to NATO is to pick up between 22 and 25 percent of the cost. Some of us believe that is still a little bit steep. But right now we are flying 75 percent of the sorties, we are delivering 90 percent of the ordnance, and I suspect when the accounting is done, we are shouldering about 75 to 90 percent of the cost of this operation.

And those are legitimate questions and I think we, as representatives of the people of the United States, have a right to ask those questions and demand honest answers.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to close this out. One of my heroes is Martin Luther King. And I have said this many times on this floor, but I do not think it could be said often enough, his last major speech that he made was at the National Cathedral here in Washington; and in that speech he said, "Cowardice asks the question, is it expedient? And vanity asks the question, is it popular? But conscience asks the question, is it right?"

It is popular to not talk about the problems we have with Social Security. It is politically very expedient not to be honest about the budget. But it is not right. And until this body, all sides of the body, until the executive branch starts becoming honest and accurate with the words they use about our budget and our situation with Social Security, we are not going to solve the problems.

We have to ask the right questions. And the first question we have to ask is, "is it right?"

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 999, BEACHES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, CLEANUP AND HEALTH ACT OF 1999

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-103) on the resolution (H. Res. 145) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 999) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes, which was reported to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### DEMOCRATS CELEBRATE EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this year the Democrats are celebrating Earth Day, which is tomorrow, by continuing our efforts to leave a real environmental legacy for this year and future years, for this generation and for the next generation. And we are proving that environmental protection and economic competitiveness are not mutually exclusive. In fact, they will be

even more compatible as technology continues to advance and as we head into the next millennium under a Democratic administration.

On the other hand, my colleagues on the other side, the Republicans, and particularly the Republican leadership, will once again try to look green for a day on Earth Day. They will tout their one or two token environmental bills.

I already heard the gentleman from the Committee on Rules, I believe, report one of those bills which is ready for tomorrow. They are going to tout these one or two token environmental bills that actually are far weaker than Democratic alternatives.

Let us really compare our agendas. Already this year the Republicans have defeated the defense of the environment amendment, designed to hold Republicans accountable for back-door attempts to roll back 25 years of environmental protection. The Republican budget also would drastically cut environmental funding by \$5.3 billion over the next 5 years. And the American people can do the math, they can see through the Republican Party's empty Earth Day gestures.

For Earth Day last year, the Republicans held a rally, and Newt Gingrich, the then Speaker, visited a zoo. However, the Republican majority spent the rest of the year gutting environmental programs in the budget and loading up appropriation bills with anti-environmental riders. These riders attempted to construct roads through national parks and forests, delay the release of important environmental standards, allow the dumping of PCBs into other nations' rivers, and increase haze in our national parks.

In fact, last year was a record year, with over 40 anti-environmental riders. In 1995 the Republicans' inability to give up on these kind of riders resulted in a government shutdown. And during the 104th Congress, the Republicans introduced the dirty water bill, which would have significantly lowered treatment standards for nearly 7,000 toxic pollutants, allowed more sewage to be dumped in the ocean, and exposed much of our remaining wetlands to pollution or development. They also proposed changes to Superfund that would have let major Fortune 500 companies off the hook for hazardous waste pollution they caused. So do not let them fool my colleagues, not even for a day.

Meanwhile, the Democrats and the Clinton-Gore administration have been working hard to strengthen health, safety, and environmental protection across the Nation, and will continue to do so into the next century.

Together, the Democrats in Congress and the administration have worked to preserve precious land, fight water pollution, improve air quality, and protect communities and children. President Clinton and Vice President GORE have completed twice as many Superfund cleanups in the last 5 years as in the previous 12 years of Republican administration, and the Clinton-Gore admin-

istration established tough new clean air standards to protect our Nation's children from asthma and other illnesses.

This year the Clinton-Gore administration's Lands Legacy Initiative will protect, enhance, and expand our national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges. The initiative will also set aside \$150 million for urban parks.

Now, while the Republicans were busy gutting the environment, the Democrats also enacted legislation to protect children's health, fully funded right-to-know and water monitoring initiatives, and issued a directive extending the moratorium on offshore oil drilling. Vice President GORE, I should add, spearheaded a nationwide Smart Growth Initiative to build livable American communities as a foundation for continued economic competitiveness in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the subject of economic competitiveness, as I said at the outset, Democrats have continually proven that we can protect the environment without harming the economy. In fact, many environmental improvement efforts actually create jobs. Jobs and the environment, job creation and environmental protection go together, and we have proved that as Democrats.

Brownfields development, for example, conserves resources by turning abandoned waste sites into productive industrial property, instead of using pristine land and encouraging urban sprawl. This creates jobs in the construction industry. But the Republicans have repeatedly held funding for Brownfields cleanups and they hold it hostage to their sham of an environmental agenda. They refuse to do it.

Let me talk about energy efficiency and renewable energy programs promoted by the administration that save energy and money and simultaneously improve environmental protection. Development of newer, more efficient and renewable technologies also creates jobs, and such efforts also enhance our competitiveness both domestically and internationally.

The administration's Smart Growth Initiative I mentioned serves as another example of providing tools to protect the environment and preserving economic competitiveness and, yes, creating new jobs. An example of the administration's success in preserving the environment and protecting our economic security can best be found in my own backyard in New Jersey, in my district. Let me give my colleague this example.

The Port of New York and New Jersey generates \$4.6 billion in annual revenue for the New Jersey and New York region and supports over 160,000 jobs. Maintaining the port's depth, the depth, if you will, for the ships to come in, is critical to the region's economy. But the Port of New York and New Jersey requests for dredging permits were continually delayed over objections of the disposal of dredge materials.

Let me explain that the traditional practice, and this was off the coast of my district, was to dispose of contaminated dredge spoils at an ocean dump site about 6 miles off the coast of my district, 6 miles really off the coast of where I live in my town, literally in our backyard. We felt that this practice was unacceptable not only to our area but for the environment in general, because of the impact on the ocean of that contaminated dredge material.

Well, the result, though, was that because the Port could not be dredged because the material could not be disposed of because of the objections to the contaminants in the disposed dredge materials, that dredging was not taking place, and there was a potential impact on the Port of New York and New Jersey in terms of jobs if shipping moved out or commercial cargo could not come in.

Well, there was a struggle. The industry and the labor people struggled for many years because of these delays. Both sides threatened litigation. But all of a sudden Vice President GORE came along and he brought everyone to the table. He brought the environmentalists who did not want the toxic dredge spoils dumped in the ocean. He brought the industrial representatives who wanted to be able to ship their goods in and out of the New York/New Jersey Harbor. And he brought the labor representatives who were concerned about the jobs.

□ 1630

He brought them all to the table, and he was critical. He was critical in brokering an agreement to close the mud dump site, the toxic waste site in the ocean, and simultaneously allow critical dredging projects at the port to move forward. So now we have major funding to do the dredging, we have closed the ocean dumping site so that the environment is no longer threatened, and we are developing beneficial reuse alternatives for the dredged material which allows the material to be used for other purposes, perhaps on land, and doing all this essentially promotes the port's viability, allows the commercial shipping to increase, allows the environment to be protected and allows even more jobs to be created in the port.

I use that as an example because I want to stress on the eve of Earth Day the leadership that the President and Vice President GORE have taken not only on environmental issues but in an effort to try to deal with environmental concerns in a way that also protects jobs and leads us toward a new technology and a new future where the environment and industry and jobs all basically work together for growth and for a good environment.

There are a lot of other examples I could use like that to show how the environment and jobs and the economy can work together.

The reason I mentioned it in part is because I think it is wrong for the Republican leadership on the other side of the aisle to make these sort of stealth attacks on the environment that they have been making for the last few years since they have been in the majority here in the House as well as in the Senate, and I think that they do not understand that by trying to break down the last 25 years or 26 years of environmental protection that has been a hallmark of the Democratic years in Congress since the first Earth Day, that by making these stealth attacks and trying to break down the legislation, the laws that protect the environment, that they are very much out of touch with the American people and what the American people want.

Mr. Speaker, the American people understand that you can have a good environment and good jobs, and they want us here in this Congress, together with Vice President GORE and President Clinton, to promote that agenda.

So I just want to say one last thing, and then I would like to yield to one of my colleagues.

On this Earth Day I am proposing a challenge to the Republicans. First, I challenge them not to do anything on the environment; in other words, try to do something progressive. I also challenge them not to gut the environment by sneaking harmful riders into the appropriations bills. That appropriations process is about to begin, Mr. Speaker. I challenge them not to sneak the harmful riders into the appropriations bills this year. I also challenge my colleagues on the other side not to cater to corporate interests and not to slash funds for important environmental health and safety programs. Rather than just making a little show tomorrow on Earth Day with one or two bills that are not very meaningful, I would challenge the Republicans to join us in creating a real environmental legacy for our children by passing the administration's livable communities and lands legacy initiatives on a broadly bipartisan basis.

And let us say that on the eve of Earth Day 1999, let us once again talk about truth. The truth is the health of our environment is in jeopardy at the hands of the Republican majority in this Congress, and the truth is that Democrats and President Clinton and Vice President GORE are the true protectors of the environment.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), who is here with some others to join me this evening.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pallone), for his outstanding leadership and his record as a Member of this Congress in support of the environment.

All of us are saddened today of course by the events yesterday out near Denver, Colorado. Our sympathies go out to the families and to the schoolchildren who suffered through that ter-

rible crisis yesterday, and none of us here today, and I think all of us are saddened by that, and we are not about to get into a partisan fight, but I think it is obvious to me that on the day before Earth Day we should take the floor to talk about the record of the Democratic Party in the Congress, the record of the Vice President and the President.

I am proud to be a Democrat because of our consistent record over the years in support of environmental legislation. I can remember when I was a staffer working in the other body when the Clean Water Act was passed, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act was enacted, and it is interesting. As my colleagues know, there were some Presidents in the past like Richard Nixon who signed some of these important legislative vehicles into law, and there was broad bipartisan support in the 1970s here in this Congress for improving the environment.

So I hope that today we will remember that this is the 29th celebration of Earth Day. The first one was April 22, 1970, and it is appropriate to call attention here in the House of Representatives to the progress that has been made in those past three decades, and certainly to the progress we have made during the 1990's to the initiative of the Clinton-GORE administration, and that is why a lot of us were concerned when we saw in the Roll Call this week that the majority leader of the majority party had decided that he was going to form a truth squad to talk about the Vice President's record on the environment.

Mr. Speaker, if it is a truth squad, it is going to be a very positive report then, because I do not think there has been a public official in my career that has done more during their term of office to work on environmental issues than Vice President GORE.

Now under this administration we have made great progress in protecting the environment, toughening enforcement of clean air and clean water laws, improving the safety of our drinking water and the food we eat, and, as my colleagues know, a couple years ago we had a terrible disaster in the State of Washington related to *E. coli*, and, as my colleagues know, I came back here, I talked to Secretary Glickman. We wanted to make certain that we got tougher standards for our meat packing plants in order to protect our kids from *E. coli*. Frankly, I was shocked in the Committee on Appropriations when one of my colleagues got up to offer a limitation to stop those regulations from going into effect, and it was enacted at the Committee on Appropriations level and then later was dropped. And I was glad that it was dropped here on the floor of the House because it would not have strengthened these safety regulations, it would have in fact weakened them. And so we were glad that that was prevented.

Also, this administration, and I can talk to my colleagues about this, has

been active in restoring and preserving roadless and wilderness areas across the Nation, and we have done all this while the Federal budget has been brought into balance and largely while the majority party here in the Congress has fought against our environmental protection efforts.

So I think the Vice President, certainly Vice President GORE, must be given a large share of the credit for this administration's successes.

I know from my State of Washington how involved and constructive the Vice President has been in helping us address some of our toughest environmental challenges in the last 6 years. He was there with President Clinton at the Forest Summit in early 1993, one of the first acts of the Clinton-GORE administration, helping to balance the need to protect habitat for endangered species and the need to sustain a way of life in the timber communities in our State. The Vice President's leadership was critically important at that time in assembling the Northwest Forest Plan which has been a great success. He was there for us when we needed help in approving several habitat conservation plans in Washington State which have become blueprints for balancing the requirements of protecting critical habitat and providing certainty for people and businesses who make their living off the land, and he is still there today helping Washington and three other West Coast States address the new challenge of the salmon listings.

I asked the Vice President and the President if they would not add \$100 million in the budget for a west coast salmon recovery initiative, and that money was added, and we are very much appreciative of it. I also asked the Vice President if he could help us with a conservation reserve enhancement program between the Department of Agriculture and the State of Washington, and he intervened to help make sure that that happened, sent Secretary Glickman again out to our State to work with us on these important issues.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to build just for a minute on the remarks that he said.

I do not know where this attack or the truth squad comes with respect to the Vice President, but clearly his record is unparalleled not only in getting our country to address and be aware of problems concerning the environment, but as a troubleshooter and as a problem solver.

We all remember the Forest Summit. Prior to that in the previous administration all we had was a train wreck where nothing was being done, more and more people were losing their job, it looked like more and more endangered species were going to be threatened, and nothing was being done. And

as a result of the Vice President and President Clinton's work and your work and others, we have started to work our way out of that problem. We have started to put new jobs back into the forest, we are starting to reconstruct some of the damage that has been done in the past, we have worked out habitat conservation areas. But that is true in the Everglades under the leadership of the Vice President. That is true on the Conference on the Oceans. That is true in Lake Tahoe. These huge natural assets, wonderful ecological environmental assets that are the jewels in this Nation, the forests of the Pacific Northwest, the Tongass, the rain forest in Alaska, the Everglades, the southern Utah wilderness areas, Lake Tahoe I have already mentioned, Monterey Bay Sanctuary; these are areas where we had nothing but controversy before, nothing but controversy and arguments and at the same time having the ecosystems deteriorate and go downhill.

This administration, under the leadership of the Vice President, stepped in and started to get communities to work together so we see in the most recent and dramatic listing of the salmon, we see the City of Seattle, we see the Governor of Washington, the Governor of Oregon, the Mayor of Portland, people talking about making this an event that they can work with, that they can help bring economic activity to the area and save the environment at the same time.

That has been the thinking of this Vice President, that the environment could be a win-win. He has also told America about the markets that are available in trade on environmental equipment to help clean up the environment in other countries. He has pushed to open those markets, billions of dollars in business that is available for companies in the United States.

So I think that, as the gentleman points out, and I will have more to say about those who would attack them and what their record would be on the environment, but my colleague makes an incredibly important point, that he has been a troubleshooter and he has brought communities together, he has given people a seat at the table where they never had one before, and as a result of that in a number of these instances we are working out a consensus, we are working out a consensus on California water, a consensus on the Everglades, a consensus on the marine resources in this Nation because people have been given a stake in the outcomes of those arrangements.

So I think you have raised a very, very important point about his role and his effectiveness over the last several years.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for his statement, and I always appreciate working with the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who probably, as our ranking member on the Committee on Natural Resources, has

probably been the strongest advocate for protecting the environment that there is in the Congress. And his point about the northwest timber situation was so absolutely on point. We were enjoying, there were zero sales coming off the Federal timber lands.

Now, as my colleagues know, there are some people in my district who were not thrilled about the levels that we got to, but at least we got something going, and at the same time the Vice President worked to get 1.2 billion over 5 years to help all these communities in northern California, in Oregon, in Washington State that had been affected by this and helped them diversify their economies, helped them get into other new businesses.

So it was not just leaving these people out there. They resolved the problem and then helped the communities deal with the transitional period.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I think that instead of attacking the Vice President, we should be praising the Vice President for that kind of a problem-solving, constructive, sensible approach to dealing with environmental issues.

□ 1645

I have known this man. He was in my class. We came to Congress together. He deeply cares about these issues, and I will say this, there is nobody who is more informed. He does his homework. He looks into these matters in great detail, whether it is national security issues, environmental issues or economic issues.

The other point my colleague makes that is so important here is that the economy today in the United States is as good as it gets. As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) said, here we are, we have decided as a country we are going to protect the environment, that Earth Day means something to us, and we still have the lowest unemployment, the lowest inflation.

The Vice President has been in charge of doing a lot of work on reinventing government to try to deal with regulations that are unnecessary and to help in those respects.

I do not think the House floor should be used to go out and attack people, especially when we have an agenda. We have to get down and get busy now and start dealing with Medicare. We have to get busy on education. We have to get busy on Social Security. We have to start passing the appropriations bills.

So for the majority to say they are going to waste the time, I think, of the House getting into a partisan attack, it just does not make any sense. We should be spending that time trying to work together in a bipartisan way to deal with these issues.

One of those issues, by the way, is the environment. I will say this, one thing that I am pleased about is that there is a sensible group of people on the other side of the aisle who have

joined with the Democrats, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and people of that nature who have joined with us on the important environmental issues and, frankly, I think we have a majority, a significant majority in this House in favor of protecting the environment.

So I think we should make this an issue that is bipartisan, that we work together on, not trying to go out and scapegoat, take partisan advantage. There is plenty of time for politics when we get to the year 2000. I think we have to do the people's business now, work on legislation, develop a record, and we can all go home and run again in 2000 on the basis of getting something done rather than playing political games.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) for his remarks. Just briefly, if I could support some of the things the gentleman said.

I was listening to what the gentleman said about the Republicans, and it is true there are some Republicans on the other side, and historically we have had Richard Nixon supporting most of the environmental legislation in the seventies, signing the law; Teddy Roosevelt with the conservation movement. I just do not understand why the Republican leadership now and for the last 4 or 5 years has taken this track of basically trying to tear down every major environmental legislation; and now, as the gentleman has said, based on this article in Roll Call, literally discussing coming to the floor to attack the Vice President rather than to do something constructive.

I just wanted to say, I was listening to what the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) said about the Vice President bringing people together, developing a consensus, giving people a seat at the table. It was amazing, when we had this whole battle over the Port Authority, how true that was. Until he came in, everybody was at odds; everybody was fighting. Nobody wanted to do anything. Nobody even wanted to sit down. We could not even get people to sit down at a table and talk, but when he showed up and then took the initiative from there, all of a sudden people were willing to listen, and they ended up standing on a stage together signing an agreement that I never thought was possible. He managed to achieve that.

I just wanted to say one more thing in that regard. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) pointed out how there are important issues here legislatively that can be dealt with in this same way. I will just use the example of the Clean Water Act. For the last 5 years now, every effort that we have made to try to reauthorize the Clean Water Act has failed because the Republicans do not want to do it. The Republican leadership refuses to bring it up.

Interestingly enough, I went to a New Jersey building trades meeting

earlier this week, and the number one issue that the building trades were concerned about was the Clean Water Act. They said we need the jobs that are created, because if we do not have the money and higher authorization levels for infrastructure needs, to build new sewage plants or other ways to deal with clean water that creates all kinds of jobs that we would like to have, those needs are unmet.

There again is an example of how we can do something to protect the environment, clean up the water, and at the same time create jobs. They recognize it themselves. Labor recognizes it themselves. So this notion that somehow jobs and the environment and economic growth do not go together is false.

The kinds of things that AL GORE has done to point out how we can bring people together to achieve those goals together is a perfect example of why it can be done if we just have a positive attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding and very much appreciate being able to join two of the gentlemen from the West who know firsthand the importance of preserving the environment. Since I join them out West in Texas, a State that appreciates open space, I too come to the floor to share the shining examples that have benefited Texas but as well the Nation.

If I might join my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS), in saying how sad I am that we have to even have this kind of debate in the shadow of the tragedy that has befallen our friends in Colorado, and to their families and to the young people that have been injured and those who have lost their lives. I clearly think that we will have a time in the future to collaborate on saving lives of young people, ending the violence.

Tragically, the day before Earth Day we are here because we hear rumors that some will come to the floor, my friends on the other side of the aisle, and begin throwing dirt one day before Earth Day about who is better for the environment or who is not, or whose position is contrary to that which promotes economic development, promotes economic stability, and I am saddened that we would do that.

This is a day, of course, that I want to offer all of my sympathies to those families.

I think it is important that we speak more positively, and in speaking more positively, I think it is important to note the facts. In particular, let me note the Vice President's assistance and support for some of the activities that we think are important in Texas. I am reminded of the hard work of former land Commissioner Gary Mauro, who worked for some 12 years in the State of Texas to promote cleaning up beaches and keeping those areas

attractive for all of Texas and all of America to enjoy.

It was the Clinton administration, the Clinton-Gore administration, that was most helpful in those efforts to recognize that our beaches, our waterfront areas, are national treasures; and therefore led the fight, along with former Commissioner Gary Mauro, to excite the people of Texas to clean up their beaches and to have the resources to do so.

I remember very much joining with members of this caucus and Members of this House to fight against eliminating the Environmental Protection Agency, which is something that had been sought by those who did not see the value. Vice President GORE was out front in preserving the Environmental Protection Agency.

How many of us remember growing up with brown water, or knowing what can happen when one turns on their faucet and the water is not clean?

So I am very grateful that Texas has been the beneficiary of some of the valuable efforts by the administration to clean up water, such as with new sewage resources. The City of Houston is in the process of a major overhaul of its sewage wastewater system, something that is extremely important, a local issue that impacts our day-to-day lives.

Particularly I think the Vice President has been a leader on tough limits on smog and soot, accelerating toxic waste cleanups, expanding the public's right to know about toxins released to air, water and land. Talk to those who suffer from asthma and other respiratory ailments and they will say who has been soft on the environment. They will say how they are pushing for us to do more about the Clean Air Act, how they are pushing to ensure that they do not have to walk around every day, whether it is in Houston, Texas, or Washington, D.C., with the air inhaler because of the difficulties in breathing.

So I think it is important to really take this day and highlight the needs of this Nation and really call a spade a spade, or to call the facts. Let us call the roll on what the Vice President has been able to do.

I will tell a personal story. Houston is known for its enormous geography, its wide spaces, enormous freeways and roundabouts and everybody in their cars, and that creates just a terrific traffic jam; the frustration of the early morning traveler, the late evening traveler; and also its desire, although we have still a long ways to go to preserve green space, to sort of encourage people to get into green spaces so that hopefully the air will be clean enough for them to be outdoors.

We are a very warm city but we are encouraging that, and in doing so we have a commitment to more hike and bike trails because we want people to get out in nature in the cities. We want the inner city to be warmly receptive to families and children. So it was the Vice President's leadership, along with

the President's leadership, that helped this transportation bill not only to be a bill of rebuilding hard infrastructure but also to focus on hike and bike trails.

I am very proud that we were able to secure some of those resources so that inner city residents in Houston, Texas, and particularly in my district, will have hike and bike trails constructed as we speak, to give them the opportunity to experience the beauty of nature, along with our clean air, to walk the trails, to see the trees, to enjoy the birds. That is all at the leadership of the Vice President.

So I think it is extremely important that we do more, and I join the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) in welcoming the efforts of the Livable Communities Task Force. I am a member of it. The legislation that they offered today, what a perfect example to show our constituents that we can work together on things that pain them: suburban sprawl, the difficulty of living in an urban area, everyone in their cars, the lack of public transportation.

I hope we can get that legislation moving. I certainly am supporting it, certainly will be encouraging the City of Houston to join in. I would simply say that it is of great desire that we do something positive and not do something negative as it relates to the environment. That is why I am here today, to say let us move the engine of change for promoting the environment and not listen to rumors about who has been doing the best and who has not. The Vice President has been at the forefront of these very important issues.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her remarks. She raises a number of very important points. We have talked about what the Vice President has done in the past, but also the fact that the Vice President has vision in talking about the future and clearly talking about issues in terms of livable communities that all of our constituencies struggle with on a daily basis.

I represent a district on the east side of San Francisco Bay where people find themselves locked in on the Interstate 80, which runs through my district, at 15 miles an hour on a good morning. People have to get up at 4:00 in the morning to commute long distances to their work.

The Vice President has asked that we start to address these issues and start to use his influence to get people to address these issues so that people can have a more livable community. That shows the kind of vision he has.

I think also when we read in the newspaper that there is going to be an attack by the leadership, the Republican leadership, on the Vice President, maybe it is a compliment. Maybe we

know a man by his enemies, because if we look at the Republican leadership it is rather shocking.

Senator LOTT has a zero rating with the League of Conservation Voters. Senator NICKLES has a zero rating with the League of Conservation Voters. Our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) has 17 percent; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the Majority Leader ARMEY, 17 percent; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has 10 percent; Senator MURKOWSKI, Chairman YOUNG, 3 percent.

Maybe we know the Vice President's effectiveness. Maybe we know his vision and maybe we know his record by those who would seek now to attack him and somehow try to diminish his stature in the environmental movement, not only in this country but around the world.

We have to understand that just in the last session, when we had the McGovern amendment to restore State park funding, 78 percent of the Republicans voted against it. The Waxman global climate change amendment, 88 percent of the Republicans voted no. The amendment I offered to stop subsidized road construction in the Tongass National Forest, 93 percent of the Republicans voted no.

We used to have a coalition here, Conservation in the United States. It was a bipartisan coalition. Many people go back and properly give Teddy Roosevelt credit for starting that. It is interesting that Business Week, hardly a voice of environmental activism, laments that the Republican Party tradition under Teddy Roosevelt of protecting land is being trashed, and it is shameful. It is the leaders of that effort who are now somehow going to attack the environmental credentials of the Vice President or say that he is wrong-headed.

□ 1700

The fact is, through his efforts both in the House and in the Senate, and as the Vice President of the United States, he has led the efforts to clean up our air, to clean up our water, to clean up the toxic sites in this Nation; to clean up the Superfund sites that plague our communities, the brownfields campaign that he started that allows us to take these toxic sites and turn them into economic opportunities, and as we have seen now in Palo Alto, California, in Richmond, California, in communities that now have economic opportunities that did not exist there before that kind of program under the leadership of this administration.

So we know what the Republicans have been doing, and we know certainly what the Republican leadership has been doing, and that is that they have launched, the minute the Gingrich revolution came to town, their first effort was to launch an attack on the basic and fundamental environmental laws of this Nation.

Now let us look at what the Vice President has been doing. He has been

going out to communities that have great environmental strife, that have had all kinds of controversy, and he has brought people together to try to sit down and work those things out. Most recently in California where we had the headwaters forest deal, where we were going to lose some of the last of the ancient grand redwoods in this Nation on the face of this Earth, it was the involvement of the Vice President and this administration that finally secured a deal. I do not like all of it, but I will tell my colleagues, it secured a deal by which we can protect those redwoods, we can allow some timber activity to continue, and the economy in that area can continue. That had been years of controversy before the administration got involved.

The same is true in California water, where the administration has brought people together to solve one of the most difficult problems, the survivability of San Francisco Bay, the survivability of the San Francisco Bay delta. In our huge, complex Federal and State water systems that are the cornerstone of our future economic growth in California, there has been the involvement and the leadership of the Vice President.

The Everglades speaks for itself. The Everglades speaks for itself. Working with the Florida delegation, making sure that the Corps of Engineers thought about the future as opposed to the past, changed the manner in which the Kissimmee River flowed, the flow of the water through the Everglades, the cleaning up of the marine resources, all with the leadership of the Vice President working with local communities. That has been the hallmark.

Finally today let me say, I know that there are many on the other side that want to attack the Vice President for his positions on global warming. Today I sat in my office with the CEO of an energy company that is building a new generation of gas-fired turbines to replace the old that will clean up the air, will provide new jobs that did not exist before, will provide a lower rate of energy because of the efficiency of these new generators, and will allow us in California, he is one part of a large industry that will allow us to start trading in the old polluting industries, get higher efficiency, lower cost out of a new generation, because of the concern. And they are willingly doing this. They have investors, they are putting venture capital into this, putting money at risk to clean up the air, recognizing and responding to the concerns about global warming.

So I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this special order. I agree with the gentleman from Washington that it is sad that we have to do this; it is sad that somehow some on the Republican side would believe that Earth Day should be celebrated by attacking the vice presidential environmental credentials, his motives and his actions and his work that has been so sterling

and has meant so much for this Nation, for the health of our water, the health of our air and the health of our families and our communities. It is unfortunate.

I believe we are in the process of restoring that bipartisan environmental coalition. More and more we see Democrats and Republicans working together. But the Republican leadership apparently still has not gotten the message, and somehow they want to try to make mileage by attacking the Vice President. It is a horrible mistake for them, and the biggest problem of it is it simply has no credibility, it is not true, and their record does not allow them to speak with any credibility about the environmental record of the Vice President or anyone else in this Nation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, and particularly for this idea of what Vice President GORE and this administration have tried to do is to be people of action. They think that we can accomplish some of these environmental goals and still save jobs and still have economic growth. There are so many examples we can use of things that need to be done in the future: Superfund, clean water, brownfields, whatever, and they have the positive attitude. Now we have the Republicans on the other side just wanting to waste our time with all of these personal attacks.

I yield to another gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

It is a great opportunity to address on Earth Day an interesting thing, and I think it is interesting that we are here today just before Earth Day.

I am told that some of my colleagues across the aisle are going to have some occasion where they seek to attack Vice President AL GORE on the environment, which seems to me a bit like attacking Mohammed Ali for not having a quick left hook. But nonetheless, we are here to discuss an important issue. Maybe somebody has already said this, but sort of attacking the Vice President the day before Earth Day on the environment, it is sort of disappointing to me. This ought to be Earth Day, not Dirt Day, and trying to spread a little dirt is disappointing.

Nonetheless, I want to add my voice to those who say that we have someone in leadership on environmental issues that are important to real people with real problems. I think when we test anyone's leadership, we ought to test it in five ways. I am going to give five tests that we ought to test the Vice President on. We ought to test whether his leadership has been real rather than abstract; we ought to test whether it has been practical rather than pie-in-the-sky; we ought to test on whether it is based on optimism rather than pessimism; and we ought to test whether he is out front and not behind; and whether or not he is a fighter or he has just given up.

I want to test him on those five issues. I want to start with whether he is a realist instead of just in the abstract. I want to tell my colleagues that I think America, Mr. Speaker, is waking up to the fact that Vice President AL GORE has come to address real, tangible, everyday concerns of commuters and workers in my district in north Seattle who are sitting in traffic, wasting their time when they could be home with their children, sitting in traffic because we have not adopted the public transportation solutions we need and we have not fully come to grips with creating livable communities. There is no one, no one, myself included, who has been as vigorous an advocate, Mr. Speaker, to say that our communities should be armed with the tools to develop livable communities, to be able to do the land use planning to stop urban sprawl. I point this out because this is not an abstract issue of my constituents; it is whether they can get home at night to play catch with their kids. That is a real issue, and this Vice President has been a realist, not an abstract, thinker.

Second, as he suggested, practical solutions. Well, I want to tell my colleagues, we have a real challenge up in the Northwest right now on salmon issues. We are losing our salmon runs and they are now on the endangered species list, and we have real challenges. This Vice President has not sat around in an ivory tower just sort of abstractly thinking about this problem. He has rolled up his sleeves, he has come to the Pacific Northwest more than any Vice President in American history, and he has gotten down literally in the trenches and the streams to talk about how we are going to solve those salmon problems, how we are going to improve habitat for salmon, how we are going to make sure salmon can spawn. He is not in Washington D.C.; he is in my district helping communities solve these salmon problems. I appreciate that, and so do the people of these communities. He is practical.

The third issue, is he an optimist or is he one of those guys that sort of says, Chicken Little, the sky is falling. Well, if we listen to what this Vice President has been saying, for instance, about the greenhouse gas problem, and everybody knows we have a problem, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are going up huge amounts, this is creating a greenhouse effect, and people are fully familiar with that. But what I have heard this Vice President say, instead of wringing our hands and saying we are going to be destroyed by this problem, he has shown optimism which good leaders need to do. Because what he has said is, we are going to go out and we are going to develop the technologies, the alternate technology sources that do not create these greenhouse gases. That is optimism, and that is what leadership is. Without a vision, people will perish. The good book was right. And having a vision

saying that our country is going to have the best technology in the world and we are going to make money off of this technology, and there is nothing wrong with making money, we are going to have the most competitive, energy-efficient technology in the world and it is going to be good for our economy. That is optimism and that is what we need when we talk about the environment.

The fourth issue, is he out front. Is he up front or is he behind the parade? I want to tell my colleagues a little story about AL GORE, those who happen to be watching this on C-SPAN. We ask ourselves, who was the first member of this body to give a speech that the American people could actually see unless they were lucky enough to get one of these few seats up in the Chamber, and it was AL GORE who gave the very first speech on C-SPAN because he was the fellow who fought to open up this Chamber to the American people so that they could watch it at home on C-SPAN. He was way ahead of the curve, way ahead of the curve when a bunch of fuddy-duddies were around here saying we cannot let the American people know what we are doing. That is typical of his efforts to be out front, and he is out front on the environment too.

The fifth issue, is he a fighter or does he give up? I want to tell my colleagues that when some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle came to try to weaken the Clean Air Act, came to try to weaken our safe food provisions which are really important. We had E. coli deaths, kids dying of E. coli poisoning in my hometown a few years ago, and incredibly, people in this body wanted to, and still want to reduce some of our food protections in our food inspection system, incredibly. Who stood up and said no to those efforts to reduce our food safety? Who stood up and fought them tooth and tongue and even said, even if you threaten to shut down the Government of the United States, I am not going to yield on that issue. It was AL GORE. He had a little help from President Bill Clinton as well.

He was right, and the American people knew he was right, and even though the folks on the other side of the aisle shut down the U.S. Government, he did not yield, he stood as a stone wall and said, you are not going to weaken the environmental laws of this country, and America knew it and America said, in part; some people, including myself, to stand up for the environment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that by any test of leadership we have a Vice President who has been real, who has been practical, who has been optimistic, who has been out front, and who is a fighter, and it does not get much better than that.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman. I thought that test that the gentleman brought forward was really a good way to show how valuable the Vice President has

been on these environmental concerns and just in general.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. I have been listening to what some of the speakers have been saying about different programs where one can both protect the environment and save jobs and where the economy can grow, and I think it was the other gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) that said that the problem with the Republican leadership is that they do not want to move forward on this agenda.

A very good example of that, I think someone mentioned, is brownfields. I live in the most densely populated State in the country. We have more Superfund sites and more hazardous waste sites that are not on the Superfund list, but still need to be cleaned up, than any other State. Yet, at the same time in our urban areas where a lot of these sites are located, if they could be cleaned up and used again for commercial or industrial or other purposes, it would mean such an economic boost to those communities because jobs would be created, new businesses would be created, and Vice President GORE has been pushing forever since he was the Vice President and when he was in the Senate and the House that we take the initiative on brownfields. Yet, this Republican leadership has continued to say, well, they do not want to deal with that, we have to deal with Superfund in general; maybe we will take it up in the context of Superfund, and they never get to it.

So there are so many examples like this where we need to move in a positive way. As the gentleman said, Vice President GORE has been very optimistic and knows we can be positive about these things, but we are constantly stymied by the other side, so I want to thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois, (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding his time.

Tomorrow is Earth Day, and I remember well as a young mom in 1970 when Earth Day was established, and at that time, we really had an environmental crisis. We had a desperate need for passage of legislation to guarantee clean air and clean water. We had toxic waste sites that were crying out for something to be done. So Earth Day highlighted that. As a result, we did see the passage of this important legislation.

We have made progress, and this is a time to really celebrate that progress. We now have Superfund legislation to clean up toxic sites, the clean air and clean water legislation, and we have a booming economy, and that is a surprise to some, not to me and others on our side of the aisle, but those are compatible concepts, that they go hand in hand, a booming economy and environmental protection.

The environment really is a non-partisan issue when one goes to a national park or one breathes clean air,

regardless of whether one is a Democrat or a Republican, these issues are important. But unfortunately, over the recent years, it has become just that, and it is so unfortunate, even today, that it has been raised in a partisan context.

□ 1715

It does, however, give us the opportunity, as Democrats, to celebrate our Democratic administration and all that it has done to fend off efforts to turn back the clock, if we look at what happened in 1995 when the Republicans actually allowed corporate lobbyists to draft attacks on environmental standards. Or when the Republicans passed bills that cut environmental funding by 25 percent, or what I really want to talk about for a minute is the regulatory reform bill that would have actually dismantled the food inspection program.

In my district lives a woman named Nancy Donley, who, because of her own personal tragic situation, that is, the death of her 6-year-old son Alex from eating meat poisoned with *E. Coli* bacteria, created an organization. She turned her tragedy into an organization that will now fight to make sure that no other children die called STOP, Safe Tables Our Priority.

As a result of working with this administration, and in particular Vice President AL GORE, the food safety initiative was adopted. They were able to defeat the so-called regulatory reform which would have dismantled the meat and poultry inspection system in this Nation, and actually pass new regulations that began in 1998, more sophisticated ways of inspection.

That inspection program was really initiated in the Upton Sinclair days at the beginning of the century and really required updating, not dismantling. So we now have a more sophisticated system that is being phased in over time. It began in 1998, and the establishment of a food safety initiative.

As part of that initiative I know that Nancy had, Nancy Donley, had Vice President AL GORE, at the announcement of what we call PulseNet, which is a new program that we have to track food-borne illness outbreaks over the Internet, so we are now able to link an outbreak of food poisoning in Maine with one that might happen in Montana, and be able to see that it is from the same cause.

In fact, there was a terrible outbreak of *Listeria*, which is a virulent form of foodborne illness, deli food, soft cheeses, et cetera, last year that resulted in major recalls across the country of those foods, and has already proven itself to save lives.

At the announcement of PulseNet, our Vice President, AL GORE, was there to talk about it as an initiative that would save lives. As we know, he has been the person who has figured out how to use the most high-tech systems to bring them down to protecting families and now protecting our food supply.

So as we look forward to Earth Day this year and we look forward to the 21st century, I think we can be happy that we have someone who has been our point person on the environment, who has been an advocate and a fighter, and has implemented already those programs that will make our air, our water, and our world safer for our families.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Last year when the appropriation bills were folded into an omnibus bill, the majority here added a long list of anti-environmental riders. They could not get those proposals through on their own merits, but they tried to hold funding for all Federal programs and services hostage to those riders. They figured that their opponents in Congress would be forced to swallow them, and that the President would agree to accept them to keep other programs operating.

But the President did not accept them. He insisted that they be taken out of the appropriations bill before he would sign it. That surprised the people who wrote the riders.

The factor they did not count on in their strategy was the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE. The President relies on AL GORE for advice on environmental matters, and it was AL GORE who said no, we cannot allow these things to happen. We have to take a stand. We have to take a stand, so that the riders faded away.

Let me give some examples of what AL GORE would not allow. He said no to proposals that would have blocked the EPA from conducting research or educational activities on global warming, a gag rule to block even a discussion of what may be the most serious environmental problem of our time.

He said no to a proposal that would have blocked clean-up of toxic PCBs, even in places where children could be affected.

The Vice President said no to proposals that would have blocked the EPA from reducing children's exposure to pesticides, and we now know that pesticides pose a much greater risk to children than they do to others, much more than we thought.

He said no to proposals that would have canceled environmental reviews on timber sales, where logging could threaten wildlife. He said no to a proposal to build a road through the middle of a migratory bird refuge, a place that is supposed to be wilderness.

He said no to proposals that would have required uneconomical logging that would have permanent damage to one of our most pristine forests. He said no to proposals that would have barred EPA from trying to improve air quality in our national parks. Because AL GORE took a firm stand, those proposals were blocked.

He has stood with us when we blocked efforts to roll back 25 years of work on cleaning up our rivers. He stood with us when we blocked efforts that would have prohibited EPA from doing more to clean up the air that we all breathe.

He stood with us on protecting children's health from asthma caused by airborne pollution, illness caused by food poisoning, and pesticide poisoning, permanent damage caused by toxic wastes let loose in the environment. The Vice President stood with us on all those issues.

The American people want clean air and water. They want freedom from pollution and contamination. They want protection of our beautiful public lands and forests, and they want protection for our wildlife. AL GORE wants them, too, and he wants all of them to have them as well. He is willing to stand up and fight for it to see that they get it.

He has been a very big help by having the courage to say no and to mean it. I am looking forward to seeing what he can do when he gets the opportunity to say yes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, and everyone who participated in this special order this evening. It is the eve of Earth Day. Earth Day is tomorrow. I think there is a lot of talk up here about what the truth is.

The truth is that the health of our environment is in jeopardy at the hands of the Republican majority in the Congress. The truth is that the Democrats and the Clinton-Gore administration are the true protectors of the environment for this Earth Day and the Earth Days in the future.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The Chair will remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair, and not to refer to residents of the gallery.

Members should also not make personal references to Members of the Senate.

#### A TRIBUTE TO MAYOR RALPH J. PERK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, tonight Cleveland, Ohio, is much poorer than it was yesterday because of the passing of Mayor Ralph J. Perk. If we were to ask residents of the city of Cleveland about et cetera city's recent history, they might point us to the bridge at State Route 21 over the Cuyahoga River as the point where 25 years ago the Cuyahoga River caught on fire, or they might direct us to the factory where Mayor Perk, while attempting to show some blue collar voters that he